

**REMARKS**

**Introduction**

All of previously pending claims 1-8, 10-36, 38-41, 43-49, 51-72, 93, 95-97, 99-108 and 110-117 have been canceled, without prejudice. The objections to claims 99-102 are accordingly no longer applicable. New claims 118-146 which have been added herein are currently pending. New claim 118 is the now the only pending independent claim; new claim 118 incorporates features of canceled claims 1, 2, 3 and 5.

**Section 112 rejection**

Claims 64-66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, as being indefinite for lack of antecedent basis for the term "the container".

Claims 64-66 have been canceled without prejudice and therefore the rejection no longer applies to those claims. It is noted that new claims 144-146 incorporate the subject matter of claims 64-66, respectively. The features of claims 144-146 have antecedent basis by virtue of their dependence from claim 118 which introduces the term "container".

**Section 103 rejections**

Claims 1, 10, 29, 105, 116 and 117 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over IBM (IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, vol. 3, no. 5<sup>1</sup>, page 36). Claims 1, 10-12, 29-31, 105, 116 and 117 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Berasi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,744,214) ('Berasi'). Claims 2, 32, 36, 43, 46-49, 51-63, 67-

---

<sup>1</sup> It is noted that in the Office Action this reference is stated to be in Bulletin vol. 5, no. 3. However, the list of cited references issued on April 22, 2005 lists the volume and number correctly as vol. 3, no. 5.

72, 93 and 106 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over IBM in view of JP11-290805. Claims 2, 32, 36, 43-49, 51-63, 67-69, 72, 93, 103, 104, 106, 114 and 115 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Berasi in view of JP11-290805. Claims 3-6, 33-35, 38, 39, 64-66, 95-97, 107, 108, 110 and 111 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over IBM in view of JP11-290805 and in further view of Spring (Metal Cleaning, Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1963, page 83-89). Claims 40 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over IBM in view of JP11-290805 and in further view of Sachdev et al. (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0066540) ('Sachdev'). Claims 7, 8, 13-28, 112 and 113 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over IBM in view of JP11-290805, Spring and further in view of Sachdev. It is submitted that no combination of the references relied upon by the Examiner teaches or suggests all of the above-recited features of claim 118 or its dependent claims 119-146.

The previously pending claims have been canceled. New independent claim 118 incorporates features of canceled claims 1, 2, 3 and 5, and recites as follows:

A method of cleaning a molybdenum mask having a series of metals deposited thereon, comprising:  
    placing the molybdenum mask into a container;  
    immersing the container within a first vessel including only a single aqueous cleaning solution including hydrochloric acid in a range of greater than 5% but less than 50% by weight; and  
    agitating the cleaning solution at a predetermined agitation level for a predetermined period of time;  
    wherein the first vessel is contained within a second vessel containing an aqueous solution surrounding the first vessel.

The Examiner has relied on the Spring reference for allegedly teaching elements of (canceled) claims 3 and 5, the features of which have been incorporated in new independent claim 118. More specifically, the Examiner relies on Spring for the teachings of:

[a] "conventional approach to handling metal parts during their cleaning wherein metal parts are placed into a container and the container is placed into the processing solution, which is contained into [sic] the vessel, surrounded by liquid and placed into another vessel, having transducers placed along its outside surfaces.

(Office Action, page 8, emphasis added), it is submitted that Spring does not actually teach or suggest all of the above-listed features.

Rather, in regard to the subject matter at issue, Spring states (at most) that "[g]lass is excellent for transmission of energy and it is very common practice to place glass containers containing the cleaning solution into an ultrasonic tank partially filled with water." Spring, pg. 88. In this quote, Spring apparently discloses the use of a first vessel having a cleaning fluid within a tank filled with water, but there is no teaching or suggestion of immersing a container having the mask to be cleaned within a first vessel having cleaning solution, which is in turned contained in a second vessel having an aqueous solution. In fact, as can be seen from the illustration of Figure 28a shown on page 89 of Spring, objects to be cleaned are contained within a mesh basket, which is then immersed directly into the ultrasonic tank. This again shows that Spring teaches only two levels of enclosure: a first vessel for containing the objects to be

cleaned, and a second level (the tank) for applying ultrasonic energy to the objects.

It is accordingly submitted that Spring fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 118 for which reliance on Spring has been placed. As none of the other references relied upon cure the deficiencies of the Spring reference in this regard, it is submitted that independent claim 118 and its dependent claims 119-146 are patentable over these references.

**Conclusion**

The Applicants believe that pending claims 118-146 are now in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the same.

A separate Request for Extension of Time is enclosed herewith, with authorization to charge the requisite extension fee to deposit account no. 04-1696. Please charge Deposit Account No. 04-1696 for any other fees required by this Amendment. The Applicants encourage the Examiner to telephone Applicants' attorney should any questions remain.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven M. Santisi". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Steven" and last name "Santisi" being more legible than the middle initial "M.".

Steven M. Santisi, Esq.  
Registration No. 40,157  
Dugan & Dugan, PC  
Attorneys for Applicants  
(914) 332-9081

Dated: March 1, 2007  
Tarrytown, New York